



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

REVIEWS AND NOTICES OF BOOKS.

ESSAYS ON THE ART OF PHEIDIAS, by CHARLES WALDSTEIN, M. A.; Director of the Fitzwilliam Museum and Reader of Classical Archaeology in the University of Cambridge; Ph. D. Heidelberg; M. A. Columbia College, N. Y.—Cambridge: University Press. New York: The Century Co. 1885. 8vo, pp. xix-431, 16 plates and 25 figures.

In the history of any science, nothing is more rare than the appearance among its professors of a man with the impulse to connect it with knowledge as a whole,—nothing except, perhaps, a man with the ability so to connect it. The great body of writers in each science know and advance it only within itself, and for the most part mechanically. Of knowledge as a true and valuable guide for human life, they have no conception; and the relation of their own science to human life they never consider, nor mark the mutual aid of sciences which illustrate different aspects of life. To ordinary workers, knowledge is the mechanical sum of sciences, not an intelligible whole, of which every special science is a member. It is, therefore, always noteworthy when a book appears, the author of which shows some appreciation of the fact that his subject stands in close relation with all knowledge; and that not the least portion of his task is to find out what that relation is. Briefly, the author of such a book is a moral teacher, as well as an advancer of learning. The science of archæology has been no richer than other sciences in men of this order. But, when such a man has come, he has influenced the whole subsequent course of the science. No better instance can be given than Otfried Müller. His *Handbuch der Archäologie der Kunst* was not only one of the books which dignify their subject and show the utility of it, but a book which laid down the lines on which to study it: lines which belonged to knowledge in general, rather than to the special science of archæology. In fact, this is true of all Müller's work: classical archaeology, the history of the classical literatures, were to him parts of the knowledge of ancient moral life, and this of moral life as a whole, interpreted by science.

Since Müller's time, archæology has for the most part settled back into itself: it has become a region apart, of interest only to the *Gelehrten vom*

Fach. Archæologists, indeed, are apt to regard as empty enthusiasm anything meant to show the general use and bearing of the facts of their science. Yet, it is the sign of a master to be able to distinguish devotion to great ideas from empty enthusiasm, and to see that, while the latter is the least, the former is the most, profitable thing in the world. There have been some signs, of late, that, among younger archæologists, the need of a truer conception of their science is beginning to be felt. M. Salomon Reinach has devoted some of the acutest pages of his acute *Manuel de Philologie Classique* to a consideration of what classical philology is. There could be no better sign. The first thing the archæologist should do, is to settle what his science is; as Dr. Waldstein says: "the progress of any branch of investigation is most seriously retarded by ignorance of its true province, its aims, and means of inquiry:" and we may add that this is the smallest part of the matter. By this ignorance, not only is progress in investigation retarded, but also the value of the science in the advancement of wisdom is made almost *nil*.

It is to give Dr. Waldstein's book high praise to say that, more than any other that has recently appeared, it expresses the new tendency among archæologists: it is in the line of advance of the true science of archæology, in its relation with knowledge in general. It is a book of principles; to quote our author again: "In these essays the general principles will be illustrated and fixed by the individual and concrete instances; while the special inquiries will be appreciated, because viewed in the light of the general definition of the archæological system." Such a book is to be judged, not in its kind, but by the wisest and highest standard: as a book, not as a piece of mechanical work. Few books deserve so high praise as this,—few archæological books, certainly. But the privilege carries with it the necessity of submitting to the severest criticism.

The first essay in the book is upon *The Province, Aim, and Methods of the Study of Classical Archæology*. That there is such an essay in the book, is one of the sources of our confidence that Dr. Waldstein is to do much to bring back to its relation with humane things the science of Archæology; and this essay contains what it would profit all archæologists and all classical students to read and ponder. One way of looking at facts and ideas, says Dr. Waldstein, is the plastic way, is having them present themselves before the mind as forms, rather than formulas; the Greeks had in a remarkable degree this plastic way of seeing things, and their art was the best reproduction of their manner of thinking. We can, then, best make ourselves acquainted with one of the most characteristic, and at the same time important and profitable, qualities of Greek thought, by the study of Greek art: and this systematic study of Greek art is Archæology, which thus shows itself to be, "together with ancient

literature a co-ordinate department of the science of classical antiquity." Therefore Dr. Waldstein objects to ranking Archæology under classical Philology. He fears a return to the Hermann point of view; *i. e.*, that all investigations of antiquity have but one use, to subserve the criticism and interpretation of the ancient authors. This is admirable; yet it may be that Dr. Waldstein carries his fear too far. We cannot help thinking that Wolf and Boeckh and Otfried Müller have made this point of view no longer possible, and that, as a matter of mere nomenclature, it is useful to say, with M. Reinach, "*La philologie classique est la science de la vie intellectuelle des anciens, et particulièrement des Romains et des Grecs.*" The name "Science of classical antiquity" is ponderous in comparison with "Classical Philology."

Of what we have quoted from this essay on the science of classical archæology, we have nothing to say but praise. To have shown that it is really a science in relation with human faculty and life, is a great achievement. Dr. Waldstein has done this, and interestingly. It may be that he has not said all there is to say; but at any rate he has said more than has yet been said.

Dr. Waldstein's remarks about the methods of research, that preliminary portion of the science of classical archæology, are excellent,—especially his exhortations to archæologists to cease studying their subject in the literary remains of antiquity, instead of training themselves to see differences in the manner and technique of works themselves. The keenness of Dr. Waldstein's eyes has been of great use to him in his own researches, and he rightly thinks that hereafter anything of importance can only be accomplished with the help of trained eyes. Yet his comparative disregard of the literary sources of antiquity has led to a certain inaccuracy in his dealing with those sources, which he will himself recognize as a defect in his work. In a certain way, it matters little that he says that "an oracle addressed to Sulla combines Beauty (*τὸ κάλλος*) with Grandeur (*τὸ μέγεθος*), as the chief characteristic" of the statue of Zeus at Olympia (p. 70), when really this statement is made by implication in the description of the vision that gave the oracle; or that, on the same page, he translates the statement of Plotinos, *ἔπειτα* (sc. *ἐπλάσεν*) *ὁ Φειδίας τὸν Δία πρὸς οὐδὲν αἰσθητὸν ποιήσας, ἀλλὰ λαβὼν (νῶ) οἷος ἂν γένοιτο, εἰ ἡμῖν ὁ Ζεὺς δι' ὁμμάτων ἐθέλοι φανῆναι*, by "Pheidias had conceived of Zeus in his imagination as Zeus would have been, if he had appeared to him face to face." Such inaccuracies, in a certain way, matter little; yet there is, in such slips, a suggestion that the author considers that most useful but easily abused book, Overbeck's *Schriftquellen* sufficient to furnish an archæologist's classical reading; and that he so little esteems the light on the science of plastic thinking to be obtained from a deep and accurate study

of Greek literature, that he would have the archaeologist content himself with isolated extracts, taken without regard to their context, bearing only on the facts of archaeology, and read for the general meaning alone. May we say that the archaeologist up to Dr. Waldstein's first high conception of his science, will not fail in the same fineness and accuracy in dealing with his written sources, that he shows in dealing with the monuments? Both will help him greatly in his science of ancient thought.

I have purposely dwelt at considerable length on Dr. Waldstein's first essay, because it is on the whole the most novel and characteristic in the book,—the most typical of the new tendency in classical archaeology. The second essay is again general, but within the limits of the science itself: it is on *The Spirit of the Art of Pheidias, in its Relation to his Age, Life and Character*. The chapter is really an essay in applied ethics. Much of it is elementary, both in art criticism and in ethics: but, also, much of it is deep-going and edifying. It is impossible to give any notion of the substance of it, beyond saying that in it much is done to show the value of the plastic way of thinking—which was that of Pheidias.

Having given us a general view, Dr. Waldstein takes us through the Parthenon, pausing, as he goes, to speak of each portion of the sculptural adornment of the building. It is interesting to find him everywhere giving individuality to his work by making what of new he himself has to contribute the centre of his essay. First, it is the metopes, and Dr. Waldstein gives, substantially as he published it in October, 1882, in the *Journal of Hellenic Studies*, his discovery of a marble head in the Louvre that exactly fitted the body of a Lapith in one of the metopes among the Elgin marbles. Then come the pediments, western and eastern. Here Dr. Waldstein describes a fragment discovered at Venice first by Mr. Woolney, the sculptor, and independently by himself; and strives to show that it had a place in the western pediment. Perhaps, what is of most interest in this attempt is the opportunity it affords the author for a complete unfolding of his method of research. No archaeologist can fail to profit by seeing so severe an induction applied to his science. Dr. Waldstein's attempt to identify the figures of the eastern pediment is also full of interest. Such keenness of eye joined with such ingenuity of mind and artistic insight can never fail to hold our attention. Yet one cannot help thinking that an attempt like this is at best only a chance for mental gymnastics, not for the obtaining of positive results.

Two of the essays in the book deal with the Parthenon frieze. They mainly consist of an elaborate discussion of some terracottas found in Paris, Rome, and Copenhagen which reproduce portions of the frieze. In a terracotta fragment of the Louvre Dr. Waldstein recognized the Athena of the eastern frieze; and a piece found in the Museo Kircheriano

at Rome proved to be the adjoining fragment. Dr. Waldstein's startling conjecture, that these terracottas were once part of the working-model made by Pheidias for the Parthenon frieze, is practically retracted in a note written afterwards and appended to the Essays. In fact, their very antiquity may well be doubted, especially in view of their relation to the plaster casts which he afterward discovered; but of this it would be incautious to judge without ocular evidence, though even the plates indicate that the plaques were not by the hand of a master.

In the essay on the chryselephantine Athena Parthenos, an attempt is made, with perhaps too much of positiveness of statement, to show that there was not a column to support the right hand of the statue with its Nike: it is asserted that, by a system of counter-weights, the Nike could be supported without a column. Relying solely on the statement in various ancient authors, that the statue was so built that, if any one should attempt to remove the portrait of Pheidias from the shield on the left, the whole would fall to pieces,—relying solely on this, Dr. Waldstein makes the following statement: "No doubt in the shield on the left hand was the weight or power which, passing through the centre, supported the right arm and gave equilibrium to the whole statue." Surely, this "no doubt" is a dangerous phrase for so uncertain a matter.

The next essay to this, *The School of Pheidias and the Attic Sepulchral Reliefs*, so far as we know, is the first in which an adequate and connected account has been attempted of the sepulchral monuments of Athens that show a resemblance in style to the Parthenon sculptures. It has long been our opinion that far too little has been made of these beautiful reliefs. The close relation between them and the more famous sculptures has indeed long since been pointed out; but with this archæologists seem for the most part to have been satisfied; apparently considering them as direct imitations, and so of little essential interest. It is reserved for Dr. Waldstein to show their independence within the limits of their manner, and to suggest that they come from the hands of some of the numerous sculptors trained in the works of Pheidias, but thrown out of public employment by the Peloponnesian war, and compelled to earn a livelihood by a humbler exercise of their skill. But again Dr. Waldstein seems to us not to keep within the bounds of a just moderation when he says that, "There can be no doubt that this class of works of sculpture bridged over the step from the art of the fifth to the art of the fourth century, that they were a stepping stone from the divine and religious sculpture to the sculpture that partook of a more human character, from the art of Pheidias to the art of Praxiteles."

The above is the last essay on the art proper of Pheidias; but a long appendix contains several essays, previously published, bearing upon the history of Greek art. First comes an account of Pythagoras of Rhegion,

and a discussion of the so-called Choiseul-Gouffier Apollo in the British Museum. This discussion, first published in 1880 in the *Journal of Hellenic Studies*, tended to show that the beautiful statue in question could not be an Apollo, but was a pugilist, and most likely the work of Pythagoras. Dr. Waldstein now adds a page or two of admirable new matter, in which he shows that the Choiseul-Gouffier statue is of a type so famous as to have been followed by the die-sinkers of coins in Sicily in the middle of the fifth century B. C., and that this type was only superseded by that established in the end of the same century by a yet more famous master, Polykleitos. Next comes an essay on *Praxiteles and the Hermes with the Infant Dionysos*, in which, after conclusively reasoning away all doubts as to the Hermes being by the famous Praxiteles, he makes a very able psychologic analysis of the spirit of the art of Praxiteles. In contrast to the art of Pheidias, with its noble naïveté, simplicity, and serene grandeur, he finds in the Praxitelean ideal a sophisticated variety, a passive, moody sensibility, giving to it that sweet melancholy which he sees as the subjective element of Praxitelean art. He presents the Hermes, with its dreamy softness, its sad abstraction and tenderness, combined with latent strength, as a typical work, enlightening us, not only as to the ideal of Praxiteles, but as to the characteristics of the Greek epoch in which he lived; and he traces a likeness between the consciousness that produced this artistic type, and that of the romanticists of our century, De Musset, Shelley, Heine, Chopin.

Dr. Waldstein ends his volume with two essays, one on *The Influence of Athletic Games upon Greek Art*; the other on *The Eastern Pediment of the Temple of Zeus at Olympia, and the Western Pediment of the Parthenon*. In the latter, the author works from Brunn's geographical method of interpretation of pedimental groups,—a method which Dr. Waldstein has thoroughly made his own.

ARTHUR RICHMOND MARSH.

RECHERCHES SUR LA GLYPTIQUE ORIENTALE par M. JOACHIM MÉNANT. Première Partie. CYLINDRES DE LA CHALDÉE. 4to, pp. 263. Paris, 1883, *Maisonneuve*.

— Seconde Partie. CYLINDRES DE L'ASSYRIE, MÉSOPOTAMIE, ASIE-MINEURE, PERSE, ÉGYPTE ET PHÉNICIE. 4to, pp. 271. Paris, 1886, *Maisonneuve et Leclerc*. [In the two volumes there are eleven plates and 433 illustrations in the text.]

In these two volumes the subject of the intaglios of Western Asia has been for the first time treated by a scholar who is an authority in Assyri-